

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
DALLAS DIVISION**

<b>KAMAL K. ROY,</b>	)	
<b>Plaintiff,</b>	)	
	)	
<b>v.</b>	)	<b>3:07-CV-1395-P</b>
	)	<b>ECF</b>
<b>UNKNOWN DEFENDANTS,</b>	)	
<b>Defendants.</b>	)	

**FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATION  
OF THE UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE**

Pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b), and an order of the District Court in implementation thereof, this cause has been referred to the United States Magistrate Judge. The findings, conclusions and recommendation of the Magistrate Judge are as follows:

**FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:**

Type of Case: This is a *pro se* civil rights action.

Parties: Plaintiff resides in Saranac Lake, New York. The Defendants are unknown.

The Court did not issue process in this case, pending preliminary screening.

Findings and Conclusions: On August 17, 2007, the Court issued a notice of deficiency and order to Plaintiff. The order notified Plaintiff that he had neither paid the filing fee nor submitted a proper request to proceed *in forma pauperis*, and that his complaint did not comply with Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8(a). The order directed Plaintiff to cure the deficiencies within thirty days and cautioned him that failure to comply with the order would result in a recommendation that the complaint be dismissed for failure to prosecute. On August 29, 2007, the clerk docketed an incomprehensible and illegible pleading submitted by Plaintiff, as an amended complaint and motion to proceed *in forma pauperis*.

On September 11, 2007, the Court issued a second notice of deficiency and order, granting Plaintiff an extension until September 28, 2007 to comply with the deficiency order filed on August 17, 2007. The order again explained what Plaintiff needed to file, and notified him that failure to comply would result in the dismissal of his action for want of prosecution. As of the date of this recommendation, Plaintiff has failed to comply with the deficiency orders filed in this case.

Rule 41(b), of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, allows a court to dismiss an action *sua sponte* for failure to prosecute or for failure to comply with the federal rules or any court order. *Larson v. Scott*, 157 F.3d 1030, 1031 (5th Cir. 1998); *McCullough v. Lynaugh*, 835 F.2d 1126, 1127(5th Cir. 1988). “This authority [under Rule 41(b)] flows from the court's inherent power to control its docket and prevent undue delays in the disposition of pending cases.” *Boudwin v. Graystone Ins. Co., Ltd.*, 756 F.2d 399, 401 (5th Cir. 1985) (citing *Link v. Wabash R.R. Co.*, 370 U.S. 626, 82 S.Ct. 1386 (1962)).

Because Plaintiff has been given ample opportunity to comply with the deficiency orders filed in this case, but he has refused or declined to do so, this action should be dismissed without prejudice for lack of prosecution. *See* Fed. R. Civ. 41(b) (an involuntary dismissal “operates as an adjudication on the merits,” unless otherwise specified); *Callip v. Harris County Child Welfare Department*, 757 F.2d 1513, 1519 (5th Cir. 1985) (setting out higher standard for dismissals with prejudice for want of prosecution).

RECOMMENDATION:

For the foregoing reasons, it is recommended that this action be DISMISSED without prejudice for want of prosecution pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b).

A copy of this recommendation will be mailed to Plaintiff.

Signed this 5th day of November, 2007.

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Wm. F. Sanderson, Jr." The signature is written in a cursive, slightly slanted style.

---

WM. F. SANDERSON, JR.  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

NOTICE

In the event that you wish to object to this recommendation, you are hereby notified that you must file your written objections within ten days after being served with a copy of this recommendation. Pursuant to *Douglass v. United Servs. Auto Ass'n*, 79 F.3d 1415 (5th Cir. 1996) (*en banc*), a party's failure to file written objections to these proposed findings of fact and conclusions of law within such ten-day period may bar a *de novo* determination by the district judge of any finding of fact or conclusion of law and shall bar such party, except upon grounds of plain error, from attacking on appeal the unobjected to proposed findings of fact and conclusions of law accepted by the district court.